

inability to love at all. Dr. Stephen invents one of her happy phrases here: she speaks of "the sexuality in which love has been infected by hostility," quoting Oscar Wilde's line: "For each man kills the thing he loves," as a clear-sighted statement of how terrible a thing "ambivalence" may be.

Students of Freud will recall how he makes the way in which the phenomenon of transference is treated in the technique of therapy one of the touchstones to whether psycho-analysis is being used or not. Dr. Stephen, in her chapter on treatment, makes it clear why a sure understanding of the transference is so necessary, and points out further what a colossal task the psycho-analyst sets himself. How far what she says is convincing will depend on the mind of the reader, partly of course on the transference—whether positive or negative—which he makes to the book; for I should not agree with the inference, which might possibly be made from this chapter, that transference is to be looked upon as purely pathological, though it has this aspect in psychogenic illness. It seems to me as normal to our civilization as is repression, the advantages of which are dealt with in the first chapter.

People unconvinced by Dr. Stephen's arguments will find that this book gives them something of the feeling of a nightmare; and this, if the hypothesis it stands for is correct, is inevitable, for the feeling of nightmare is engendered by the fear that just such impulses as those here described will come to consciousness. Other readers will see the immense hope which this tabooed knowledge gives us for the future; for, as Dr. Stephen says, it should enable us to recognize the early signs of maladjustment in children and thus to avoid a great deal of neurosis for the coming generation. I. F. GRANT DUFF.

PHILOSOPHY

Schiller, Prof. F. C. S. *Must Philosophers Disagree? And Other Essays in Popular Philosophy.* London, 1934. Macmillan & Co. Ltd. Pp. 359. Price 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR SCHILLER has always had a high

and refreshing scorn for philosophy in the accepted sense, and particularly for the professional philosopher. The present volume is avowedly "popular," but a pragmatist can perhaps afford to be "popular" better than most philosophers. The essays and papers which compose the book spread over a considerable area of space and time in respect of the place and date of their delivery (the bulk of them are papers read to learned societies or lectures delivered to—generally—American audiences) and range from a highly diverting account of the methods (and morals) of examiners in the "Greats" School at Oxford to the presidential address to the Society for Psychical Research delivered in 1914.

To the eugenicist the most important element in the book will be the stress which Professor Schiller's brand of philosophy, perhaps alone among philosophies as such, enables him to lay on practical questions of race degeneration and improvement. Indeed, a humanist philosophy, one would expect, should necessarily concentrate on eugenics, though it is arguable whether from the time of Protagoras to our own Professor Schiller is not the first to realize the importance of this.

To the philosopher his treatment of novelty is undoubtedly the most valuable, and not least perhaps because it contains a line of thought and argument that will appeal to and can be made use of by philosophical speculation which does not necessarily share the pragmatist preoccupation with the personal element, and does not accept the pragmatist's definition of truth. As for that, one who is not a pragmatist might be inclined to suggest that the most valuable and important sections of the book tacitly imply a conception of "absolute" truth which theoretically can find no place in Professor Schiller's philosophy.

The *raison d'être* of philosophy, it has sometimes been suggested, is to co-ordinate the sciences and cover the ground they leave untouched. Really this reverses the position. It is not so much that the scientist discovers the real and the philosopher fits the pieces together (or even less that the philosopher

disregards the scientist and goes his own sweet way constructing imaginary "reals" of his own) as that the philosopher tries to make a consistent world safe for the sciences to live in without their mutual destruction—an increasingly difficult task. Kant attempted it in his day and most present-day metaphysics are directly or indirectly concerned with the same problem, and pragmatism from its nature particularly so. But Professor Schiller, in his most suggestive treatment of teleology, is far from being merely the submissive recorder of scientific achievement that perhaps his view of truth should make him. As he points out more than once, the sequence A—B may mean not "because A therefore B", but "A in order that B." All that science can observe is the sequence—as Hume showed long ago—and Kant's attempt to put back causality as an *a priori* category begs the question—if mind puts cause there mind can take it away, and it is clearly the duty of pragmatism to see if a teleological concept "works" as well as or better than a merely causal one.

The truth of the matter is that the rigid and arbitrary "billiard-ball" conception of causality so long beloved of the sciences is a serious stumbling-block, and now that even the scientists are admitting indeterminism into their theories there is more hope for metaphysics.

Must philosophers disagree? We hope so. The principle of "novelty" indeed makes it almost essential, and the world would be the poorer if there were no one for Professor Schiller so entertainingly to disagree with.

W. L. FARRER.

STERILIZATION

Crowley, Ralph H., M.D. *The Role of Sterilization in the Prevention of Mental Defect and Disorder.* (Howard Journal, Vol. IV, No. 1, 1934.)

DR. CROWLEY states that if there has been in some quarters exaggeration of the social evils arising from mental defect and disorder, of their alleged unchecked growth, and of neglect on the part of the State to combat so

serious a menace to its welfare, it is yet more true that there has been serious lack of appreciation on the part of individuals and the community generally of the facts of the situation and of the need to take more energetic action to secure prevention of these evils. It may be observed, however, that it is no less true to say that individuals and the public are bewildered by the lack of more precise knowledge in regard to the modes of transmission of hereditary factors, the complexity of the problems involved, and the opposing views of experts. Indeed, Dr. Crowley warns us that the issues are not clear cut, and that we may find ourselves lost in a sea of controversy as to the parts played respectively by heredity and environment. Also he reminds us that this latter consideration is an essential difficulty when we come to consider the place and value of sterilization as a means of combating the influence of mental defect and disorder; and he emphasizes the fact that sterilization may be expected to prove of value in direct proportion to the part played by heredity, and that environmental factors may accentuate inherited weakness.

It will be remembered that the Brock Committee, of which Dr. Crowley was a member, used the term environment in a wide sense to include any adverse circumstance of the surroundings in the life history of mentally defective individuals at any stage after the fertilization of the ovum up to the time at which the development of the mind is complete. But although the date of fertilization can be ascertained with accuracy, different views may be held as to the time when the development of the mind is completed. Moreover, this may vary in different subjects although the legal definition of mental defect, "a condition of arrested or incomplete development of mind existing before the age of 18 years, whether arising from inherent causes or induced by disease or injury," may mislead some to consider that the development of the mind reaches completion at this age.

Dr. Crowley reminds his readers that the Committee instituted an inquiry into the mental condition of the children of known